Remarks

In the Final Office Action mailed on 2 August 2007, the Examiner maintained the earlier rejection of all remaining claims (1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-16) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bianco (United States Patent Number 5,357,572).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal of same.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

The Examiner maintained the earlier rejection of all remaining claims as anticipated by Bianco. In an interview conducted 5 September, the Examiner insists that Bianco's clearing of pointers that point to secure information is the same as the recited resetting of the secure information. Applicants' undersigned attorney suggested in that interview that the claimed resetting is clearing or erasing all secure information while, by way of contrast, Bianco is merely erasing pointers to the secure information while leaving the secure information intact within the circuit. The Examiner's interview summary mailed 12 September indicates that the Examiner finds the terms "reset", "clear", and "erase" synonymous in this regard and thus insists that Bianco teaches erasure of the secure information pointing to column 6, lines 17-31.

Applicants respectfully and strongly disagree. Applicants have attempted to clarify in the interview and in this amendment that the "reset" logic and function of the claimed invention clears **_all_** secure information in the circuit. Bianco clearly does not teach such a structure or step. Applicants have amended various claims to clearly recite that the secure information, **_all secure information_**, is cleared by the reset logic and functions of the claimed invention. This is clearly distinguished from Bianco wherein the secure information still resides in the circuit under test and only a series of pointers to the information is erased by Bianco's reset logic. This amendment does not require a new search since the Examiner has clearly indicated in the interview and interview summary that she considers the erasure and/or clearing of secure information identical to the earlier claimed reset function and structure.

Conclusion

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 13 for editorial clarity and to better protect the invention and have thoroughly discussed the Examiner's rejection. Applicants have traversed the Examiners rejection of all claims under §102 and have requested reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections.

No additional fees are believed due. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/Daniel N. Fishman/_____
Daniel N. Fishman (Reg. No. 35,512)
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)